

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 5-41 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 21-28 and 38-41 over Katz in view of Hoffman

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 21-28 and 38-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,424,706 to Katz et al. ("Katz") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,980,670 to Hoffman et al. ("Hoffman"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1, 2 and 5-8 recite crediting wireless airtime units to a wireless service account based on an interaction of an entity with a **web site** of a seller of goods or services; and **directing payment for goods or services with the wireless airtime units credited to the wireless service account.** Claims 21-28 recite crediting wireless airtime units to a wireless service account based on an interaction of an entity with a **web site** of a seller of goods or services; and **reducing the maintained count of wireless airtime units in the wireless service account when the entity exchanges wireless airtime units for a given good or service.** Claims 38-41 recite a wireless service account maintaining a count of wireless airtime units; and a processor in communication with both an **e-tailer website** and the wireless service account, the processor being configured to **increase the count of wireless airtime units when the entity actively interacts with a given feature of said e-tailer web site.**

Thus, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 21-28 and 38-41 clearly require an earning of **wireless airtime units for interaction with a web site for goods or service.**

Katz appears to disclose a system and method of accessing the value associated with a pre-purchased amount of telecommunication time for making telephone calls (see Abstract). Customers pre-purchase telecommunication time for use later in placing **telephone calls** (see col. 1, lines 31). The system and method allows its subscribers to access the value associated with any unused pre-paid telecommunication time for users to acquire goods and services (see Katz, col. 4, lines 39-56).

Katz fails to disclose or suggest anything other than allowing users to prepay for telecommunication time, and then to allow them to retrieve their prepaid money to acquire goods and service.

Katz fails to disclose, teach or suggest earning wireless airtime units for ANY action, much less earning of wireless airtime units for interaction with a web site for goods or service as claimed by claims 1, 2, 5-8, 21-28 and 38-41.

The Examiner cites Hoffman to allegedly teach awarding airtime minutes to users by said users performing action on a website or the Internet (Office Action, pages 2-3). In the Response to previous Arguments on page 12, the Examiner further indicates that Hoffman teaches a system where Internet reward providers with free air time based upon purchases made in a website. As support, the Examiner cites the passages at col. 4, lines 5-25 and col. 32, lines 15-27.

At col. 4, lines 10-13, Hoffman teaches a tokenless electronic reward system that does not require the recipient to use any portable man-made memory devices such as smartcards or magnetic stripe cards. According to Hoffman, during a commercial transaction, points are credited toward the future purchase of a product or service, or can be credited to free air time for phone calls. (Hoffman, col. 4, lines 17-20)

The Examiner also cites the definition of an IPT (Internet Point-of-Sale) Terminal listed by Hoffman at 32, lines 21-27 as somehow teaching that the sale of goods or services via the Internet rewards recipients with free air time minutes (Office Action at 12).

How the definition of an IPT ties in with Hoffman's teaching at col. 4 is not understood, and is non-sensical, as there is no teaching or even a mention of use of an IPT in the teaching at col. 4. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is mashing the definition of an IPT with the tokenless electronic reward system taught at col. 4 with improper hindsight with the claims of the present application in mind.

Neither Katz nor Hoffman, either alone or in combination, teach earning of wireless airtime units for interaction with a web site for goods or service, as required by claims 1, 2, 5-8, 21-28 and 38-41. Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 21-23 and 26 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9-15 over Hoffman, and claims 16-17 over Hoffman in view of Katz

In the Office Action, claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Hoffman in view of Kats. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 9-17 require offering wireless airtime units to a user in response to the user having actively interacted with a given web site.

As discussed above, neither Hoffman alone (with respect to claims 9-15) nor Hoffman in view of Katz (with respect to claims 16 and 17), teach offering wireless airtime units in response to a user having actively interacted with a given web site, as required by claims 9-17. Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 9-17 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 18-20 over Walker in view of Hoffman

In the Office Action, claims 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,377,669 to Walker ("Walker") in view of Hoffman. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 18-20 require offering wireless airtime units to a user in exchange for the user actively interacting with a given web page; and crediting a wireless device account associated with the user with a given number of wireless airtime units based on the user having actively interacted with the given web page.

The Examiner cites col. 8, line 17 of Walker for allegedly disclosing offering free phone time to a user in exchange for the use usage of traveling services (Office Action, page 12).

Walker, at col. 8, clarifies what is meant by service, i.e., the number of miles traveled, mode of transportation, and the like. Thus, Walker fails to disclose or suggest providing any type of credit for interacting with anything, much less disclose or suggest crediting a wireless device account associated with a user with a given number of wireless airtime units when the user actively interacts with a given web page, as required by claims 18-20.

As discussed above, Hoffman fails to teach earning of **wireless airtime units** for active interaction with a given **web site**, as required by claims 18-21. Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 18-21 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Response to the Examiner's Response to Arguments

The Applicant's thank the Examiner for the indication that the previous claim term "accessing information" was very broad and allowed Walker to read on Applicant's claim language (Office Action at page 12, last paragraph).

In response, the claims herein are amended to more clearly recite, in various language variations, **active interaction with a given web site for goods or services**.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William H. Bollman", written over a horizontal line.

William H. Bollman

Reg. No.: 36,457

Tel. (202) 261-1020

Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC

2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor

Washington D.C. 20036-3307